## **REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. Claims 1-11 and 13-22 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-4, 9-11 and 13-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,031,904 to An ("An") in view of U.S. 6,219,790 to Lloyd, et al. ("Lloyd") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,438 to Kodosky, et al. ("Kodosky").

Claims 5-8 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *An*, in view of *Lloyd*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,016 to Sladek ("Sladek").

In this response, Claims 1, 2, 5, 9 and 16-18 have been amended. The amendments to the claims are merely to clarify features, and do not require a new search of the prior art. No claims have been canceled or added.

## I. REJECTION OF THE CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met: (1) the prior art reference, or combination of references, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations; (2) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings; and (3) there must be a reasonable expectation of success. (MPEP §2142). None of these criteria are met in the present case.

A. There Is No Motivation To Modify Or Combine The Cited References

The Office Action does not provide a motivation to combine An and Kodosky, and one skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify An to include a privilege token

As stated by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, "[t]o imbue one of ordinary skill in the art with knowledge of the invention in suit, when no prior art reference or references of record convey or suggest that knowledge, is to fall victim to the insidious effect of hindsight syndrome where that which only the inventor taught is used against its teacher."

W.L. Gore & Assocs v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 1553, 220 USPQ 303, 312-13 (Fed. Cir 1983). The Federal Circuit has recently reiterated that "the tests of whether to combine references need to be applied rigorously." McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc., 262 F.3d 1339, 60 USPQ2d 1001, 1008 (Fed. Cir. 2001). Broad, conclusory statements regarding the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are not "evidence." (McElmurrary v. Arkansas Power & Light Col., 995 F.2d 1576, 1578, 27 USPQ2d 1129 1131 (Fed. Cit. 1993)), and a general relationship between fields of the prior art references is insufficient to suggest the motivation to combine such references (see In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999)).

Guided by the foregoing principles, the Office Action statement that "[i]t would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use a privilege token method of validation inasmuch as ... it is merely one of a plurality of well known methods of validation" does not meet the standard for an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The stated goals are so general and vague that they cannot rationalize the specific invention that is claimed. It is well-settled that "[i]t is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or 'template' to piece together the teachings of the prior

art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious" and that "[o]ne cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention." (In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992); quoting In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

It appears that impermissible hindsight was used to generate the foregoing statement of motivation.

The fact that references can be combined or modified is not sufficient to establish prima facie obviousness

"The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination." In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Although a prior art device "may be capable of being modified to run the way the apparatus is claimed, there must be a suggestion or motivation in the reference to do so." *id*, 916 F.2d at 682, 16 USPQ2d at 1432. In addition, the fact that the claimed invention is within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art is not sufficient by itself to establish prima facie obviousness. MPEP 2143.01, citing Ex parte Levengood, 28 USPQ2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter 1993). The level of skill in the art cannot be relied upon to provide the suggestion to combine references. Al-site Corp. v. VSI Int'l Inc., 174 F.3d 1308, 50 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

The Office Action does not state any specific <u>motivation</u> found in An, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, for An to use a privilege token. The Office Action merely states that "a token method of validation ... is merely one

of a plurality of well known methods of validation." Even if a privilege token were one of a

plurality of well known methods of validation, which it is not, that is not sufficient motive to

use a privilege token in An.

The Office Action statement that "it would not affect the operation or teach away

from the service provisioning aspect of An et al. inasmuch as the validation process is a

separate one from the provisioning process" also does not provide any motivation to combine

the references, merely that they could be combined.

An teaches that an authentication server validates a user's right to modify services for

a specified DN (Distinguished Number) through the use of a password or PIN Personal

Identification Number), or some other mechanism. (An, Col. 7, lns 50-54). While there are

many various authentication methods, such as passwords and PINs, that can be used to

authenticate a user in An, there is no motivation to specifically use a privilege token that

includes subscriber privilege information associated with the subscriber as an authentication

mechanism.

An would require substantial redesign to arrive at the claimed invention

An obviousness rejection also is not appropriate if substantial reconstruction or

redesign of the prior art references is necessary to arrive at the invention, as is the case with

the cited references. (See In re Ratti, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959).

In the claimed invention, different users can have different access privileges. Such a

system wherein different users are associated with different privileges is said to provide

"differentiated services." For example, in a system that provides differentiated services, one

subscriber may be allowed to subscribe to services A, B and C, another subscriber may only

-19-

have privileges to subscribe to services A and B. In contrast, in An, any user can subscribe to any service.

In one embodiment, a privilege token is used in the claimed invention to provide differentiated services. As An does not provide differentiated services, An would not be motivated to use a privilege token as a method of authentication, as An has no use for the additional subscriber privilege information stored in a privilege token. None of the cited references convey or suggest a privilege token that includes subscriber privilege information. The system of An would have to be substantially redesigned in order to provide for a privilege token that includes subscriber privilege information.

Furthermore, if the system of An were to be modified to include a privilege token as a method of validation, many unnecessary changes would be needed to the system to implement the privilege token. For instance, a privilege token associated with the subscriber that includes subscriber privilege information would need to be generated. When a simple password or PIN method of authentication is sufficient for validation, as in An, there is no motivation to use a privilege token that would require an additional step to generate a token. This is especially true as the token in the claimed invention includes subscriber privilege information. There is no motivation in An or any other cited reference to store unused information in a privilege token. The significant redesign of An to include a privilege token when differentiated services are not even provided plainly shows that the references lack motivation to combine.

As the Office Action states, there are many well known methods of validation. A person skilled in the art would have no motivation to seek out a new method of authentication that requires additional information.

An and Kodosky cannot be combined because they are not analogous art

It is improbable that one skilled in the art of managing telephone services subscriptions would look to the art of embedded graphical programming techniques for a suggestion or motivation with respect to validating or authenticating a user. As stated in MPEP 2141.01(a), "[t]he examiner must determine what is 'analogous prior art' for the purpose of analyzing the obviousness of the subject matter at issue... In order to rely on a reference as a basis for refection for an applicant's invention, the reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned."

Here, the claimed invention concerns managing wireless network service subscriptions. *Kodosky* is concerned with providing a flexible programming environment that allows users to design virtual instrumentation applications. The graphical programs created using the system of *Kodosky* can be downloaded to an embedded system for execution in a real-time manner. The teachings of *Kodosky* are not at all pertinent to the problem of managing wireless network service subscriptions.

In a case in which a combination of two references were used in support of an obviousness rejection, the Federal Circuit state that "[t]he combination of elements from non-analogous art sources, in a manner that reconstructs the applicant's invention only with the benefit of hindsight, is insufficient to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness. There must

be some reason, suggestion, or motivation found in the prior art whereby a person of ordinary

skill in the field of the invention would make the combination." In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d

1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Therefore, In re Oetiker stands for the proposition

that it is not proper to combine non-analogous prior art. One skilled in the art of managing

wireless network service subscriptions would not find a motivation or suggestion to turn to

the Kodosky reference for any reason, much less to add an unnecessary privilege token to the

a service that does not provided differentiated services...

For all the foregoing reasons, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been

established. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-11

and 13-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

B. The Cited References Do Not Teach Or Suggest All Of The Claim Limitations

Even if there was motivation to combine the references, which there is not, the cited

references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

A Privilege Token that includes subscriber privilege information associated with a

subscriber is not taught or suggested by Kodosky

The Office Acton states that the privilege token recited in independent claims 1, 5, 9,

16, 17 and 18 is taught by Kodosky at Fig. 16 and Col. 20, lines 10-39. However, Kodosky

does not actually teach a privilege token as used in the claimed invention. Kodosky teaches

that tokens, as a general concept, can be used to arbitrate who has read/write privilege to

different fields of a shared memory block when bi-directional channels are used.

The token in *Kodosky* is a generic token used to determine which user currently has

read/write privileges. In Kodosky, token "owners", as shown by FIG. 16, can read or write

-22-

data at any time. Users who are not current owners of tokens have more limited read-only privileges.

The value of the token in *Kodosky* is determined by the current "owner" of the token. When a user "owns" the token, the user is allowed both read and write access to a data area. After the user that "owns" the token has written information to the data area, the user can then pass the token to a second user. The second user will then "own" the token, and have privilege to write to the shared data area. By only allowing one user at a time to "own" the token, *Kodosky* ensures that concurrent conflicting writes to the same data area do not occur.

In contrast, the privilege token recited in claims 1, 5, 9, 16, 17 and 18 includes "subscriber privilege information." This subscriber privilege information is used to determine whether the subscriber associated with the privilege token has privileges sufficient to carry out the requested modification (claims 1, 5, 16, 17, 18), or to automatically log into subscribed services (claim 9). The generic token taught by *Kodosky* does not include any information at all, much less subscriber privilege information.

None of the cited references teach or suggest storing privilege and service information in a directory repository

Claim 13 recites the step of:

generating a list of only those telecommunications services for which the subscriber has a privilege to subscribe to, based on privilege information and service information that is stored in the directory repository and associated with the subscriber, said privilege information associated with the subscriber specifying what telecommunications services the subscriber has privileges to subscribe to;

None of the cited references teach or suggest storing privilege information and service information associated with a subscriber in a directory repository. The Office Action

asserts that "the feature profiles are stored locally either on service 50, machine 52, as well as

in profile repository 18" as taught by An teaches this limitation. This is an incorrect reading

of An.

Col. 3, lines 27-34 of An teaches that "the profile repository for a given service

manager is a memory storage allocation which may be stored on the respective service

manager node on the machine which implements the features or on some other intermediate

machine." This does not teach generating a list of only those telecommunications services

for which the subscriber has a privilege to subscribe to based on privilege information and

service information that is stored in the directory repository and associated with the

subscriber as recited in Claim 13. An only teaches storing profiles in a repository. An does

not teach or suggest storing privilege information and service information associated with a

subscriber, much less storing this information in a *directory* repository.

Conclusion

In addition to the above-discussed limitations, each of the dependent claims

introduces one or more additional limitations that independently render it patentable.

However, in view of the patentability of the independent claims, the dependent claims are not

further argued at this time to expedite prosecution.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-11 and 13-22 are

patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the

rejection of Claims 1-11 and 13-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

-24-

**AMENDMENT** 

Ser. No. 09/800,646 filed March 6, 2001, PRASAD et al

Examiner: Hector AGDEPPA, GAU 2642

Docket No. 50325-0508

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that such contact would be helpful in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Lesley Coulson Boveri

Reg. No. 46,642 Date: July 7, 2005

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550 San Jose, CA 95110-1089 (408) 414-1080

Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 223131450.

on <u>July 7, 2005</u>

by